

EXHIBIT A



HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

LAWRENCE LESSIG
ROY L. FURMAN PROFESSOR OF LAW AND LEADERSHIP
1563 MASSACHUSETTS AVE
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS · 02138
TEL. (617) 496-8853
LESSIG@LAW.HARVARD.EDU

November 12, 2020

President Donald J. Trump
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable William Barr Attorney General

The Honorable Jeffrey Rosen
Deputy Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC, 20530

Re: Ari Teman

I have reviewed, *pro bono*, the case involving Ari Teman. Ari was convicted for acts that certainly do not establish a crime nor evince any criminal intent. I urge the Justice Department to dismiss the case or the President to pardon Mr. Teman.

The facts underlying this case involve a business dispute between Mr. Teman's company, GateGuard, and some of its clients. Those clients had failed to pay for the services GateGuard had provided. Pursuant to the terms agreed to by the clients and GateGuard, Mr. Teman effected a transfer of funds from the clients' bank accounts to GateGuard. The clients had contractually authorized GateGuard to collect overdue fees in this way. The contract that authorized this was not crafted by Mr. Teman, but by his lawyers. They had patterned the agreement on other well known companies (such as AirBnB). The lawyers' work obviously cannot be the foundation for a finding of Mr. Teman's fraudulent intent.

Whether GateGuard's contract should be enforceable in a civil court is an interesting question for academics to consider. GateGuard's customers acknowledged they received the contracts; they claimed they hadn't read it. Again, that poses an interesting question for a contracts exam. It doesn't evince fraudulent intent by

Mr. Teman. Indeed, the reality of online commerce is that agreements like this are the norm. The judge in this case suggested that the terms authorizing the transfer of funds were buried in the contract. GateGuard's contract is actually quite concise relative to many online agreements. The suggestion that a surprising term in an online agreement constitutes an intent to defraud would render most banks and credit card companies guilty of fraud. Nothing in GateGuard's terms of service is extreme or unusual.

The judge in this case, writing to uphold a jury verdict, was constrained to justify the jury's verdict. He was therefore persuaded that the fees charged were unreasonable. And he was skeptical that the terms authorizing a transfer were in fact present at the time the clients agreed to the contract.

But the fees were charged as many contracts — cell phones contracts for example — provide today: a low monthly fee that is accelerated if a contract is terminated early, or not kept current. And the evidence in this case demonstrates conclusively that the term authorizing transfers from the clients' accounts was both part of the original agreements and expressly acknowledged by at least some of the clients.

What explains this prosecution is not the law, nor the justice within this commercial dispute. What explains it, apparently, is the relative inexperience of the front line prosecutors. Those prosecutors were new to the U.S. Attorney's office. They allowed their inexperience to guide their intuitions. And once it was clear that they had uncovered not a criminal commercial enterprise but ordinary online commerce, rather than acknowledging their error, and the injustice in prosecuting a commercial dispute as a crime, they continued to press the prosecution against Mr. Teman.

This behavior is surprising and troubling to those like me who have high regard for United States Attorneys. Yet it is clear that sometimes, winning becomes more important than justice. The prosecution of Mr. Teman is not justice. It is not a credit to the work of the Department. I urge you to take whatever steps are possible to stop this prosecution before Mr. Teman is sentenced to prison.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Lessig